


2000
Consumer Satisfaction
for
Comtrea Community Treatment
A Substance Abuse Traffic Offenders Program (SATOP)
of the
Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse
Missouri Department of Mental Health



Christine Rinck, Ph.D., Project Director, Consumer Satisfaction
UMKC Institute for Human Development, a UAP
Kansas City, Missouri

Gary Harbison, MA, DMH Outcomes Coordinator,
Office of Quality Management

Christine Squibb, Director, Office of Consumer Affairs



Thanks to the many people who completed the survey and to the staff of participating agencies. Thanks to the members of the Consumer Satisfaction Work Group, the Outcomes Work Group and the Performance Measurement Group.

August 2000

DMH Satisfaction Survey Results

Consumer Satisfaction - 2000

Substance Abuse Traffic Offenders Program (SATOP)

Agency: Comtrea Community Treatment

Demographics

		Total State	Total Agency	Total OEP State	Total OEP Agency	Total WIP State	Total WIP Agency	Total CIP State	Total CIP Agency
SEX	Male	76.7%	76.2%	72.0%	73.3%	81.6%	75.0%	84.6%	100.0%
	Female	23.3%	23.8%	28.0%	26.7%	18.4%	25.0%	15.4%	0%
RACE	White	89.1%	100.0%	90.2%	100.0%	89.9%	100.0%	84.3%	100.0%
	Black	6.3%	0%	4.2%	0%	6.6%	0%	11.8%	0%
	Hispanic	2.5%	0%	3.6%	0%	2.4%	0%	2.0%	0%
	Native American	1.0%	0%	.8%	0%	.9%	0%	2.0%	0%
	Pacific Islander	.4%	0%	.4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Other	.7%	0%	.9%	0%	.2%	0%	0%	0%
MEAN AGE		33.11	31.43	33.19	31.53	35.73	29.75	38.88	34.00
	0-17	4.1%	0%	1.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	18-49	85.9%	95.2%	88.6%	93.3%	88.6%	100.0%	88.5%	100.0%
	50+	10.0%	4.8%	10.3%	6.7%	11.4%	0%	11.5%	0%
Of the 21 forms returned, 21 identified the type of SATOP program.									

Sample Size

Information is based on the number of returned forms and the number of people served according to the DMH billing records. The forms sent to the agency did not indicate program type (e.g., WIP). The program type was to be entered on the form as the forms were distributed. Many forms, however, were received with the program type not indicated. Since an accurate count of forms received by individual programs cannot be calculated, this column is left blank.


	Number Served April 2000	Number Forms Returned	Percent of Served Returned
Total State	2422	1513	62.5%
Total Agency	33	21	63.6%
OEP	15	15	
WIP	12	4	
CIP	6	2	
<i>Of the 21 forms returned, 21 identified the type of SATOP program</i>			

Services for the Deaf or Hard of Hearing

The following represents the percentage of affirmative responses for each item. Item 1(a) "Do you use sign language?" reflects the percent of only those who are deaf or hard of hearing who use sign language. Item 1(b) "Did this agency have signing staff?" reflects the percentage of agencies consumers who are deaf or hard of hearing identified as having signing staff available for those who use sign language.

	Overall Agency Totals		OEP Program Total		WIP Program Total		CIP Program Total	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
Are you deaf or hard of hearing?	3.5%	4.8%	3.5%	6.7%	3.8%	0%	0%	0%
(a) If yes, do you use sign language?	12.5%	0%	5.6%	0%	6.7%	0%	0%	0%
(b) If yes, did this agency have signing staff?	28.6%	0%	33.3%	0%	100.0%	0%	0%	0%
Did this agency use interpreters?	5.5%	0%	3.5%	0%	5.3%	0%	0%	0%

Overall Satisfaction with Services




Program Satisfaction: Percent of responses to the question "How satisfied are you with the services you receive?"

Some of the key findings were:

- Overall, 89.3% of the individuals served by the SATOP program were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their services.
- The percent of individuals served by this agency who rated themselves as "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with services was higher than the state average (95.2% for this agency versus 89.3% for the state).
- The WIP and CIP programs were rated higher than the other program (100.0% with at least a "satisfied" rating). The participants in the OEP program also rated the services highly (93.3% with at least a "satisfied" rating).

Service Means Comparison of 1998, 1999 & 2000



Comparison of 1998, 1999 & 2000 Mean Ratings

Some of the key findings were:

- The mean satisfaction with services rating for this agency was 4.90 in 1998, 4.33 in 1999 and 4.76 in 2000.
- The mean satisfaction with services rating has improved from last year.

Satisfaction with Services

How satisfied are you . . .	Total Consumers ^a		OEP Program		WIP Program		CIP Program	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
1. with the agency staff who provide you with services?	4.47 (1447)	4.57 (21)	4.47 (547)	4.47 (15)	4.52 (425)	4.75 (4)	4.65 (51)	5.00 (2)
2. with our counselor/instructor?	4.63 (1447)	4.86 (21)	4.68 (548)	4.87 (15)	4.64 (425)	4.75 (4)	4.79 (52)	5.00 (2)
3. with how much your agency staff know about how to get things done?	4.47 (1448)	4.70 (20)	4.47 (546)	4.67 (15)	4.47 (423)	4.67 (3)	4.62 (52)	5.00 (2)
4. with how program staff keep things about you or your life confidential/private?	4.48 (1427)	4.65 (20)	4.46 (540)	4.67 (15)	4.53 (420)	4.33 (3)	4.65 (52)	5.00 (2)
5. that the program staff is assisting you achieve the goals of driving without drinking?	4.52 (1439)	4.76 (21)	4.50 (544)	4.80 (15)	4.60 (426)	4.50 (4)	4.73 (52)	5.00 (2)
6. that the agency staff who provide services to you respect your ethnic and cultural background?	4.58 (1390)	4.79 (19)	4.54 (518)	4.79 (14)	4.63 (414)	4.67 (3)	4.69 (51)	5.00 (2)
7. with the services that you receive?	4.47 (1444)	4.76 (21)	4.47 (547)	4.73 (15)	4.50 (424)	4.75 (4)	4.65 (52)	5.00 (2)
8. that services are provided in a timely manner?	4.40 (1449)	4.75 (20)	4.41 (549)	4.67 (15)	4.39 (426)	5.00 (3)	4.69 (51)	5.00 (2)
9. with how easy it is to get to services?	4.30 (1447)	4.67 (21)	4.28 (547)	4.73 (15)	4.35 (425)	4.25 (4)	4.50 (52)	5.00 (2)
10. with how easy it is to get to contact the agency?	4.35 (1437)	4.57 (21)	4.31 (547)	4.60 (15)	4.41 (423)	4.25 (4)	4.65 (51)	5.00 (2)
11. with how you spend your time while at the agency?	4.29 (1439)	4.62 (21)	4.29 (547)	4.53 (15)	4.29 (421)	4.75 (4)	4.60 (52)	5.00 (2)
12. with where the agency is located?	4.22 (1438)	4.52 (21)	4.21 (547)	4.67 (15)	4.31 (420)	3.75 (4)	4.60 (52)	5.00 (2)
<i>How safe do you feel...</i>								
13. in the agency/program site?	4.46 (1444)	4.67 (21)	4.41 (549)	4.80 (15)	4.51 (425)	4.00 (4)	4.67 (52)	5.00 (2)
14. in the neighborhood of the agency/program site?	4.43 (1444)	4.67 (21)	4.40 (547)	4.73 (15)	4.47 (425)	4.25 (4)	4.73 (52)	5.00 (2)
<p>The first number represents a mean rating. Scale (items 1-12): 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied. Scale (items 13-14): 1=Not at all safe . . . 5=Very safe. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item. ^aThe number of consumers in each program may not add to the total number of consumers served because the type of program (e.g., WIP) was not indicated on many forms.</p>								

Some of the key findings were:

- Participants in the SATOP programs were satisfied with the agency staff who provided services (mean of 4.57). They were more satisfied with their counselor/ instructor (mean of 4.86).
- The highest rated item at this agency was with their counselor/instructor (mean of 4.86).
- The lowest rated item was where the agency is located (means of 4.52).
- The participants were satisfied with the services they received (mean of 4.76).

Outcome

Due to my SATOP experience...	Total Consumers		OEP Program		WIP Program		CIP Program	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
15. I am less likely to drink and drive in the future	4.52 (1452)	4.71 (21)	4.55 (551)	4.80 (15)	4.55 (425)	4.50 (4)	4.56 (52)	4.50 (2)
16. My drinking habits will change	4.23 (1452)	4.67 (21)	4.19 (549)	4.73 (15)	4.30 (424)	4.50 (4)	4.54 (52)	4.50 (2)
17. My understanding of alcohol or drugs has improved	4.46 (1454)	4.90 (21)	4.45 (550)	4.93 (15)	4.50 (426)	4.75 (4)	4.60 (52)	5.00 (2)
18. I now better understand myself	4.11 (1451)	4.52 (21)	4.00 (549)	4.60 (15)	4.17 (424)	4.25 (4)	4.44 (52)	4.50 (2)
19. I now spend less money on alcohol/drugs	4.12 (1443)	4.48 (21)	4.06 (549)	4.40 (15)	4.20 (421)	4.50 (4)	4.67 (52)	5.00 (2)
20. I better understand Missouri's DWI laws and penalties for DWI	4.47 (1457)	4.81 (21)	4.54 (554)	4.93 (15)	4.39 (426)	4.25 (4)	4.60 (52)	5.00 (2)
21. My attitude toward the police, courts, DOR and SATOP has improved	3.76 (1452)	4.24 (21)	3.78 (552)	4.13 (15)	3.74 (424)	4.25 (4)	4.13 (52)	5.00 (2)
22. I better understand the relationship between consumption/use (amount) and levels of impairment	4.41 (1457)	4.81 (21)	4.43 (553)	4.87 (15)	4.40 (427)	4.50 (4)	4.69 (52)	5.00 (2)
The first number represents a mean rating. Scale: 1=Definitely do not agree . . . 5=Definitely agree. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.								

Some of the key findings were:

- The participants reported that they were less likely to drink and drive in the future (mean of 4.71; 1=definitely do not agree with the statement to 5=definitely agree with the statement).
- There was a better understanding of alcohol and drugs (mean of 4.90) and Missouri's DWI laws (mean of 4.81).
- The participants agreed with the statement: "My attitude toward the police, courts, DOR and SATOP has improved" (mean of 4.24).

Staff Attitude and Performance

	Total Consumers		OEP Program		WIP Program		CIP Program	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
23. Were you told of your right to a second opinion?	79.0 (1108)	65.0 (13)	75.6 (408)	64.3 (9)	84.4 (346)	50.0 (2)	84.6 (4)	100.0 (2)
24. Were you told of your right to a judicial review?	74.0 (1031)	47.6 (10)	71.9 (386)	46.7 (7)	79.0 (320)	25.0 (1)	72.5 (37)	100.0 (2)
25. Were you told of the six month shelf-life rule?	65.8 (907)	38.1 (8)	63.8 (339)	26.7 (4)	76.0 (310)	50.0 (2)	57.1 (28)	100.0 (2)
26. Did SATOP attempt to coerce or require you to attend some other (non-SATOP) program which was not required by the court or DOR?	20.4 (285)	4.8 (1)	16.6 (90)	0 (0)	24.9 (101)	25.0 (1)	15.7 (8)	0 (0)
The first number represents the percent that answered "Yes". The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.								

Some of the key findings were:

- Over half of the participants reported that they were told about their right to a second opinion (65.0%).
- Less than half of the participants reported that they were told about the six-month shelf-life rule (38.1%).